

Appl. No. 10/806,926,
Amdt. Dated July 11, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 15, 2006

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated May 15, 2006.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2. In view of the amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the application should be allowed.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Patent Office objected to the limitation of "an adjustment bar pivotally attached to the housing." Applicant has amended claim 1 to provide "an adjustment bar attached to the fold plate." There is support in the specification for this claimed structure at page 19, lines 18-23 of the specification. Thus, claim 1 is definite and the rejection under §112, first paragraph has been overcome. Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and also overcome the §112 rejection.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Groenenberg. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 2. Claim 2 was identified as being allowable in the Office Action. Therefore, the rejection under §102 has been overcome and claims 1-11 are allowable.

Claim 11 was rejected under §102(b) as anticipated by or in the alternative under §103(a) as obvious over Groenenberg in view of Applicant's admitted prior art. Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and includes all the limitations thereof. As discussed above, claim 1 is now allowable, as it has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 2. Thus, the rejection of claim 11 has been overcome.

Appl. No. 10/806,926/²
Amdt. Dated July 11, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 15, 2006

Therefore, all pending claims 1-11, 21, 23 and 24 are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

David L. Newman
Seyfarth Shaw
Attorneys for Assignee
55 East Monroe Street
Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803
312-346-8000

By 